## IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

| FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUI          |  | U.S. COURT OF APPEALS                                   |
|----------------------------------|--|---|
|                                  | No. 05-12918 Non-Argument Calendar                             | ELEVENTH CIRCUIT November 30, 2005 THOMAS K. KAHN CLERK |
| D. C.                            | Docket No. 05-00694-CV-MI                                      | HS-1  |
| CHASE HOME FINANCE               | ELLC,  |   |
|                                  |  | Plaintiff-Appellee,                                     |
|                                  | versus   |   |
| LUCINA CARRANCO, and all others, |  |   |
|                                  |  | Defendant-Third Party-Plaintiff-Appellant,              |
|                                  | versus   |   |
| STATE COURT OF COBI              | B COUNTY,  |   |
|                                  |  | Third Party-Defendant-Appellee.                         |
|                                  | from the United States District the Northern District of Georg |   |
| _                                | (November 30, 2005)  |   |

Before MARCUS, WILSON and PRYOR, Circuit Judges.

## PER CURIAM:

Lucina Carranco appealed an order to remand a dispossessory action to state court and award attorney's fees for Carranco's improper removal. This court dismissed the appeal of the order of remand for lack of jurisdiction, but the appeal of the award of attorney's fees was permitted to go forward. Because Carranco did not challenge the award of attorney's fees in her brief, that argument is considered waived. See Rowe v. Schreiber, 139 F.3d 1381, 1382 n.1 (11th Cir. 1998).

In deference to Carranco's <u>pro se</u> status, even if we liberally construed Carranco's brief to address the underlying merits of the award of attorney's fees, we would affirm. The standard of review would be for abuse of discretion. <u>Legg v. Wyeth</u>, \_\_ F.3d \_\_, No. 04-13489 (11th Cir. Oct. 25, 2005). Because Carranco concedes that the complaint against her did not raise a federal question and removal was not proper under <u>Georgia v. Rachel</u>, 384 U.S. 780, 792, 86 S. Ct. 1783, 1790 (1966), the district court did not abuse its discretion in awarding attorney's fees.

## AFFIRMED.